

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, it is respectfully submitted that the finality of the Office Action is improper because the Examiner has issued a new rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 even though the claims have not changed form. Nevertheless, claims have been presented in a form believed to be more preferred by the Examiner. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

In the previous amendment, the Applicant explained in great detail and respectfully submitted that evaluating a calculation expression can comprise determining at least one value for at least one field of data stored in a database. The value can, for example, be the value of the field "State" in the record "ACC003" which is equal to "NY" and not equal to "CA" (specification page 13-14). Furthermore, in view of the written specification, one skilled in the art will readily know that evaluating a calculation expression defined based on a field of a database can include determining the value of that field as stored in a record in a database. Again, The Examiner's attention is directed, for example, to Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition, which defines a field as "a location in a record in which a particular type of data is stored." Clearly, a value stored for a field can be provided as input to a calculation expression in order to evaluate the expression. In addition, it is abundantly clear that determining whether to grant access can either result in a determination to grant access or a determination not to grant access (claim 56). Still further, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11, 38 and 43 recite: "evaluating said calculation expression for each of said plurality of records." Hence, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, these claims do NOT omit an essential step. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner's rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 if fully traversed below for at least the following reasons:

a) *Bapat et al.* does NOT teach: a calculation expression defined based on at least one field of data used in records stored in a database (claim 11)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that “each row of the Granted permissions Table is defined by a meaningful combination of variable characters or variable expression” (Final Office Action, page 13). *Bapat et al.* teaches a Granted Permissions Table. Clearly, a table is not the same as a calculation expression. Furthermore, the values in the Granted Permissions Table of *Bapat et al.* are constant values. In other words, “user name”, “object name” and “operation type” have been specifically defined with constant values (e.g., use-x, object-xyz and SELECT). As such, it is respectfully submitted that a table that specifically lists constant values cannot possibly teach or suggest a calculation expression defined based on at least one field of data used in records stored in a database. As recited in claim 11: “said at least one field of data is a variable which may have different values for each of said plurality of records.” Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

b) *Bapat et al.* does NOT teach: evaluating a calculation expression for records stored in a database based on a field of data used to define the calculation expression (claim 11)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that checking the Granted Permissions Table “to see if user has specific granted items” teaches evaluating a calculation expression. Clearly, looking up a value in a table does not teach or even remotely suggest evaluating a calculation expression. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. It should also be noted that *Bapat et al.* teaches using both a Granted Permissions Table and a Denied Permissions Table (Figures 15A and 15B). Hence, *Bapat et al.* teaches away from evaluating a calculation expression in order to control access to records stored in a database as it teaches looking up multiple tables to control access to the records.

c) *Bapat et al.* does NOT teach: determining at least one value for a field of data stored in a record and using it to evaluate the calculation expression (claim 11)

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that checking a "grant" table to see if a user has specific "granted items" does NOT or suggest these features.

d) *Bapat et al.* does NOT teach: determining a first result for the calculation expression based on evaluation of the calculation expression for a record (claim 11)

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that "check[ing] the Grant table to see if user U1 has specific granted items, and grant[ing] access if the current operation matches the operation specified in the Grant table" does NOT teach or suggest this feature (Col. 28, lines 1-3 of *Bapat et al.*). Again, it is noted that *Bapat et al.* teaches enforcing access control based on permission and deny tables. However, it is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in *Bapat et al.* with respect to determining a first result for calculation expression based on evaluation of an expression for a particular record.

e) *Osentogki* does NOT teach: defining a calculation expression that can be evaluated for each of a plurality of records in a database to determine whether to grant access to a particular record (claim 53)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that a user profile table (table I) is an expression that can be evaluated for a plurality of records stored in a database. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that a user profile table is not an expression evaluated for records. Clearly, a table is not an expression that can be evaluated.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all the rejections to the claims.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

/RMahboubian/
R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

July 25, 2006

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300